

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 24, 33 and 39 are currently being amended.

Claims 42-51 are being added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-51 are now pending in this application.

Claims 1-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,009,511 to Mazar et al. (hereinafter “Mazar”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In accordance with embodiments of the present invention, a signal from a monitoring device includes a general broadcast emergency signal. Thus, as described in the specification, it is the monitoring device which broadcasts the general emergency signal. See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0021]. Accordingly, independent claim 1 recites “a first signal ... from a monitoring device ... comprising at least a general broadcast signal ...” Independent claims 12 and 24 recite a similar feature.

Mazar fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claims 1, 12 and 24. Instead, Mazar discloses monitoring devices 102, 104, 106 gather data, but an alert is generated by a host 112 device. See e.g. Mazar, Figure 2. Further, with regard to the description of Figure 5, Mazar discloses an alarm sent from a repeater, e.g., repeater 610. Both the host 112 and the

repeater 610 are distinct from the monitoring devices. There is no disclosure in Mazar that any of the monitoring devices 102, 104, 106 generate, or are capable of generating, “a general broadcast signal.”

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 12 and 24 are patentable.

Further, in accordance with embodiments of the present invention, as described in the specification, “mobile devices within communication range of the monitoring device 100 can be configured to relay this message” Specification, paragraph [0021]. Thus, the emergency broadcast signal can be received by “all mobile devices equipped with the minimal event handling capabilities.” Specification, paragraph [0021]. Applicant has amended each of independent claims 33 and 39 to more clearly recite this feature of the present invention.

Mazar fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claims 33 and 39. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner alleges that Mazar discloses a “general broadcast emergency signal.” Specifically, the Examiner argues that the “transmissions sent from the medical device of Mazar et al. to peripheral devices or directly to the communication system 110 comprise a ‘general broadcast emergency signal’” Office Action dated May 29, 2007, page 3. However, as noted above and recited in the pending independent claims, the general broadcast emergency signal of the present invention is adapted for receipt by all mobile devices within communication range of the monitor and being equipped with at least minimal event handling capabilities. The transmissions disclosed in Mazar can only be received by registered peripherals, not by “all mobile devices within communication range of the monitor and being equipped with at least minimal event handling capabilities.”

Since Mazar fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of the pending independent claims 33 and 39, claims 33 and 39 are patentable.

Claims 2-11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

For example, claim 11 recites “determining a target for the second signal” which is transmitted from the mobile wireless event handling device. Mazar fails to teach or suggest this feature. Specifically, Mazar is silent as to determination of any target device for receipt of any signals. The monitoring devices 102, 104, 106 send the signal to a final receiving device as configured a priori. Thus, while the embodiments of the present invention provide that the mobile wireless event handling device determines a target for the second signal, any such determination in Mazar, if one exists, would be made by the monitoring device. Accordingly, Mazar fails to teach or suggest this feature of claim 11.

Similarly, claims 13-23 depend from allowable claim 12, claims 25-32 depend from allowable claim 24, claims 34-38 depend from allowable claim 33, and claims 40-41 depend from allowable claim 39. Therefore, claims 13-23, 25-32, 34-38 and 40-41 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant has added new claims 42-51. Support for new claims 42-51 is found in the originally filed specification, claims and figures. For example, claims 47-51 each recite “information conveying location of the monitoring device.” Support for this feature can be found in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0022]. Further, claims 42-51 each depend from one of allowable claims 1, 12, 24, 33 or 39 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 29, 2007

By /G. Peter Albert Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268